

FAME: Fault-attack Aware Microprocessor Extensions for Hardware Fault Detection and Software Fault Response

Bilgiday Yuce, Nahid Farhady Ghalaty, Chinmay Deshpande, Conor Patrick, Leyla Nazhandali, Patrick Schaumont

Virginia Tech

HASP 2016

This research was supported in part through the NSF Grant 1441710, and in part through the SRC.

Embedded Systems are Everywhere Virginia Tech.
V7/

• Threat model expands from software into hardware.

Fault Attacks on Embedded Software Virginia Tech.
V77

• Inject engineered faults into with a specific security objective in mind

Virginia Tech.
V77 Fault Attacks on Embedded Software

-
- Inject engineered faults with a specific security objective in mind
- Analyze fault response of the software to break the security

Virginia Tech. Why are Faults a Security Issue?

- May enable leakage of secret information
- Even correct output may leak the secret information.

```
// Elliptic Curve Cryptography
//		(Simplified)	Scalar	Multiplication
…
Q[0] = 2Q[0];Q[1] = Q[0] + (P)Q[0] = Q[key-bit];return Q[0];
                    Inject a fault into P 
                                           If the fault does not affect the 
                                           output, key_bit is 0.
```
Virginia Tech.
Vzd How should We Handle Faults?

-
- **Fault handling** can be separated into Fault Detection and Fault Response
- Fault Detection:
	- It must be low-latency
	- It must be hard-to-bypass

Hardware Fault Detection

Virginia Tech.
V_{7/} How should We Handle Faults?

- Fault handling can be separated into Fault Detection and Fault Response
- Fault Detection:
	- It must be low-latency
	- It must be hard-to-bypass
- Fault Response:
	- It must be application-specific
	- It must be adaptive

Hardware Fault Detection

Software Fault Response

Virginia Tech.
V77 How should We Handle Faults?

- Fault handling can be separated into Fault Detection and Fault Response
- Fault Detection:
	- It must be low-latency
	- It must be hard-to-bypass
- Fault Response:
	- It must be application-specific
	- It must be adaptive
- **Communication** between Fault Detection and Response
	- SW Fault Response must be aware of HW fault status
	- Processor HW must have features to support fault-attack resistant execution of SW Fault Response

Hardware Fault Detection

Software Fault Response

- Combination of HW/SW extensions
- Captures faults using fault detectors in HW level
- User-defined fault policy in SW level
- Fault-attack resistant execution of fault policy
- Status & recovery information to fault handler

Nominal Mode

Software

Hardware

Software

Hardware

Operation of FAME - 4

Virginia Tech. $\sqrt{\mathbb{Z}}$

Operation of FAME - 4 Virginia Tech. $\sqrt{\mathbb{Z}}$

Operation of FAME - 5 Virginia Tech.

 $\sqrt{\mathbb{Z}}$

Nominal Mode

; AES Start

 \cdots

 \cdots

; Round 10, addRoundKey

LD MEM[key_address], R1

LD MEM[state address], R2

XOR R1, R2, R2

MEM[state_address], R2 **ST**

Safe Mode ; Trap handler ; Read FRRs to determine the valid FRR ; and get the trap return address 40001fcc <read asr> call

; Restore the pre-fault state of R2 40001f4c <write asr> call

; Return from trap **rett** <next instruction>

Prototype Design: FAME against Time Violation Virginia Tech.

- Protects against setup time violation attacks
	- Clock/voltage glitching
	- Voltage underfeeding
- Extends a Leon3 processor to FAME
	- 32-bit, 7-stage RISC Pipeline
- Implemented and tested on a Spartan6 FPGA of a SAKURA-G board

Virginia Tech. Fault Injection and Evaluation Setup

Virginia Tech. Case Study: The Cost of FAME

• Hardware Overhead (9% logic, 15% regs)

• Software Overhead (application dependent)

- FAME provides a HW/SW solution to handle fault attacks:
	- Low-cost
	- Performance-efficient
	- Adaptive
	- Backward-compatible

- FAME is generic
	- Can support multiple fault detectors/sources
	- Can support multiple CPU architectures

Virginia Tech How do Existing Methods Handle Faults? $\sqrt{77}$

- Full fault-tolerance
	- Information, temporal, or spatial redundancy
	- Either in Software or Hardware

- Detect-and-Despair
	- Mute/Lock the device
	- Initiate a hard-reset event
	- Kill/Destroy the device

- Software countermeasures
	- Instruction Duplication, Application-specific redundancy, Concurrent Error Detection
	- Performance Hit and increased footprint
- Fault tolerant design
	- Redundant hardware design (similar overhead)
- Secure Processors
	- Memory integrity, confidentiality, attestation, isolation, ...
	- Do not address faults

How do FRRs Maintain the Backup State? Virginia Tech.
V77

• FRR allow to rewind the *selected* processor state one clock cycle, just before the fault was injected.

- Minimum Content of FRR:
	- Return address to the interrupted program
	- Processor status register
	- Register file inputs of write- back stage

Virginia Tech.
V77 How do FRRs Maintain the Backup State?

• FRR allow to backtrack *selected* processor state one clock cycle, before the fault was detected.

- Minimum Content of FRR:
	- Return address to the interrupted program
	- Processor's status register
	- Register file inputs of write- back stage

- Timing Violation Detector
	- caused by glitches
	- caused by voltage starving

- Optical, EM, overvoltage, .. detectors
- Memory/Register checksum

Operation of FAME - 5 Virginia Tech.

 $\sqrt{\mathbb{Z}}$

Why are Faults a Security Issue? Virginia Tech.
VZZ

• May enable leakage of secret information by altering the data flow

```
// (Simplified) AES AddRoundKey
…
state = secretKey \wedge state;
ciphertext = state;return ciphertext;
                                 Zeroize the state 
                                           Ciphertext will be equal to 
                                           secretKey
```
